



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,193	01/04/2000	JAMES R. TIGHE	062891.0292	8822

7590 03/03/2004

BAKER & BOTTS LLP
2001 ROSS AVENUE
DALLAS, TX 752012980

EXAMINER

COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/477,193

Applicant(s)

TIGHE ET AL.

Examiner

Carl Colin

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In response to communications filed on 11/26/2003, applicant amends claims 1-3 and claims 26-27. The following **claims 1-45** are presented for examination.

2. The amendments to the specifications on pages 2-3, filed on 11/26/2003, have been considered.

2.1 Applicant's arguments, pages 18-19, filed on 11/26/2003, with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 26, under 35 USC 102 (e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Fiori teaches establishing a secure communication, but does not explicitly state that the communication is between a trusted network and an untrusted device external to the trusted network. Fiori also fails to disclose the modifying address step to specify the port of the proxy. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. Regarding claims 3 and 27, the rejection has been withdrawn for the same reason described above. Fiori discloses intercepting a call in reference to figure 1 at the network terminal (see also column 6, lines 33-34), but fails to disclose a trusted network. Regarding claims 11-13, 35-37, and 43-45, the rejection has been withdrawn for the same reason described above. Regarding claims 22-23 and 39-40, Fiori discloses list of network addresses but the rejection has been withdrawn for the same reason described above concerning trusted and untrusted network. Upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of two new references. Hokari teaches communications between a trusted network and an

Art Unit: 2136

untrusted network. Cohen et al. discloses the modifying step of network addresses to specify a port of a proxy. Regarding the other dependent claims, the teaching of Fiori still applies as far as disclosing the limitations of the other original dependent claims. A new ground of rejection is made in view of Fiori under 35 USC 103 (a).

Specification

2.2 The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities on page 18, line 7:

“24b” should be replaced with --24a--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

Art Unit: 2136

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3.1 **Claims 14-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,455,855 to **Hokari**.

3.2 **As per claim 14, Hokari** discloses a communication network for establishing a telephone call between a trusted telephone and an untrusted device, the communication network comprising: a first trusted network; a trusted telephone coupled to the first trusted network (see abstract); a PBX 102 that meets the recitation of an authentication controller coupled to the first trusted network and operable to evaluate a call initiation request received from an untrusted device external to the first trusted network (column 4, lines 13-16); and a PBX 103 that meets the recitation of a call manager operable to initiate the creation of a telecommunication link between the trusted telephone and the untrusted device in response to a positive evaluation of the call initiation request (column 4, lines 13-59).

As per claim 15, Hokari discloses the limitation of wherein the call manager is further operable to initiate the creation of a telecommunication link between the untrusted device and the trusted telephone comprises establishing a telecommunication link using PBX 103 that meets the recitation of a telephony proxy whereby all telecommunications between the trusted telephone and the untrusted device are communicated through the telephony proxy (see figure 1).

Claim 16 recites the same limitation as claim 14 implemented in software and is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.1 **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,455,855 to **Hokari** in view of US Patent 6,584,562 to **Fiori** and in view of US Patent 6,389,462 to **Cohen et al.**

4.2 **As per claim 1, Hokari** substantially teaches a method for establishing a telephone call between a trusted Internet Protocol (IP) telephone and an untrusted device (abstract); the method comprising, receiving a call initiation request from an untrusted device external to a trusted network, indicating a desired communication with a trusted IP telephone coupled to the trusted network (column 4, lines 13-16); evaluating the call request and establishing a

Art Unit: 2136

telecommunication link between the untrusted device and the trusted IP telephone in response to a positive evaluation of the call initiation request (column 4, lines 13-59); associating a first logical port with the trusted device and a second port logical port with the untrusted device (see figure 3); receiving first telecommunication data from the untrusted device at the first logical port (see column 4, lines 13-15). receiving second telecommunication data from the trusted device (see column 5, lines 15-17). **Hokari** does not explicitly state that the trusted device is an IP telephone. It is known in the art that the trusted subscriber could be a trusted IP telephone.

Fiori in an analogous art discloses a similar design wherein the subscriber is an IP telephone (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Hokari** to provide a subscriber as an IP telephone as taught by **Fiori** to connect the subscribers to an Internet connection (see column 1, lines 13-47). This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Fiori** so as to connect the subscribers to the Internet.

Hokari further discloses the step of modifying the sub-address information to specify the ISDN numbers assigned to the PBXs (see column 4, line 33 through column 5, line 35). To one skilled in the art the ISDN numbers meet the recitation of the ports of the proxy. However, **Cohen et al.** in an analogous art discloses modifying a first source address information to specify the second logical port of the telephone proxy and communicating the data with the modified first source address information to the server (see column 8, lines 28-37); modifying a second source address in the second telecommunication data to specify the first logical port of the telephone proxy and communicating the data with the modified second source address information to the client (see column 8, lines 37-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2136

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Hokari** to provide the step of modifying a first source address information to specify the second logical port of the telephone proxy and communicating the data with the modified first source address information to the trusted device and reverse it to communicate with the untrusted device as taught by **Cohen et al.** to establish a transparent connection between the trusted device and the untrusted device. This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Cohen et al.** so as to establish a transparent connection between the trusted device and the untrusted device.

5. **Claims 2-10, 17-20, 22-34, and 38-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,455,855 to **Hokari** in view of US Patent 6,584,562 to **Fiori**.

5.1 **As per claim 2, Hokari** substantially teaches a method for establishing a telephone call between a trusted Internet Protocol (IP) telephone and an untrusted device (abstract); the method comprising, receiving a call initiation request from an untrusted device external to a trusted network, indicating a desired communication with a trusted IP telephone coupled to the trusted network (column 4, lines 13-16); evaluating the call request and establishing a telecommunication link between the untrusted device and the trusted IP telephone in response to a positive evaluation of the call initiation request (column 4, lines 13-59). **Hokari** does not explicitly state that the trusted device is an IP telephone. It is known in the art that the trusted subscriber could be a trusted IP telephone. **Fiori** in an analogous art discloses a similar design wherein the subscriber is an IP telephone (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Hokari** to provide a subscriber as an IP telephone as taught by **Fiori** to connect the subscribers to an Internet connection (see column 1, lines 13-47). This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Fiori** so as to connect the subscribers to the Internet.

As per claim 3, Hokari discloses the limitation of wherein receiving a call initiation request from the untrusted device comprises intercepting a call initiation request at an entry point to the trusted network servicing the trusted IP telephone, the call initiation request sent from outside the trusted network by the untrusted device (see column 4, lines 13-16 and column 4, lines 38-43).

As per claim 4, Hokari discloses the limitation of wherein evaluating the call initiation request comprises determining whether the trusted IP telephone is a proper recipient of a telephone call from an untrusted device (see column 4, lines 13-37 and column 2, lines 48-53).

As per claims 5-6, Hokari discloses the limitation of wherein determining whether the trusted IP telephone is a proper recipient of a telephone call from an untrusted device comprises determining whether a network address of the trusted IP telephone is included in a list of approved network addresses and whether a network address of the untrusted device is included in a list of approved network addresses (see column 2, lines 48-53). It is obvious that the identification numbers referred to herein can be in form of network addresses in an internet connection as in figure 1 of Fiori.

As per claim 7, both references substantially disclose the claimed method of claim 2. **Hokari** discloses communication exchange. **Hokari** does not explicitly disclose which type of communication such as media streaming. It is well known in the art that the invention of **Hokari** is capable of implementing media streaming. **Fiori** in an analogous art discloses wherein evaluating the call initiation request comprises determining the untrusted device is requesting the establishment of media streaming with the trusted IP telephone (column 3, lines 31-67 see also column 4, lines 45 et seq.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Hokari** to implement media streaming as taught by **Fiori** to exchange communications and file transfer.

As per claim 8, **Hokari** discloses the limitation of wherein establishing a telecommunication link between the untrusted device and the trusted IP telephone comprises establishing a telecommunication link using PBX 103 that meets the recitation of a telephony proxy whereby all telecommunications between the trusted IP telephone and the untrusted device are communicated through the telephony proxy (see figure 1).

As per claims 9-10, **Fiori** discloses way of determining the type of data transmitting by the subscribers that meets the recitation of monitoring the telecommunication link to determine whether the telecommunications being sent by the untrusted device use an appropriate audio format and media streaming (column 3, lines 31-67 see also column 4, lines 45 et seq.).

As per claims 17-20, **Hokari** substantially teaches the claimed network of claim 14. **Hokari** does not explicitly state that the trusted device is an IP telephone and the ISDN network is coupled to the Internet and a PSTN using a gateway. **Fiori** in an analogous art discloses an ISDN network coupled to the Internet and a PSTN using a gateway (see abstract). To one skilled in the art, it is apparent that the invention of **Hokari** can be coupled to the Internet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of **Hokari** to provide a subscriber as an IP telephone and coupled to the Internet and the PSTN using a gateway as taught by **Fiori** to connect the subscribers to an Internet connection (see column 1, lines 13-47 and figure 1). This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Fiori** so as to connect the subscribers to the Internet.

Claims 22 and 23 recite the same limitation as claims 5-6 wherein the authentication controller comprises list of addresses of network devices permitted to receive telephone calls from the untrusted and list of network addresses permitted to communicate with the trusted telephone (column 2, lines 48-53 and columns 4-5). It is obvious that the identification numbers referred to herein can be in form of network addresses in an internet connection as in figure 1 of **Fiori**.

Claims 24-25 recite the same limitations as claims 9-10 and are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 9-10.

Art Unit: 2136

Claims 26-34 recite the same limitations as claims 2-10 respectively by referring to a software instead of a method and are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 2-10.

Claim 38 recites the same limitations found in claims 14-15 with respect to IP telephone in claim 2 and are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 2 with the citations of claims 14 and 15.

Claims 39-42 recite the same limitations as claims 22-25 respectively by referring to an apparatus instead of a network and are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 22-25.

6. **Claim 21** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,455,855 to **Hokari**.

6.1 **As per claim 21**, the additional trusted network is a design choice and does not depart from the spirit and scope of the invention of **Hokari**, which is not limited to one network. To a person having ordinary skill in the art, it is obvious that the communication network described by **Hokari** may comprise a second trusted network.

7. **Claims 11-13, 35-37, and 43-45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,455,855 to **Hokari** in view of US Patent 6,584,562 to **Fiori** and further in view of US Patent 6,389,462 to **Cohen et al.**

7.1 **As per claim 11**, both references substantially teach the claimed method of claim 8.

Neither of the references explicitly teaches the modifying step as recited in claim 11. **Cohen et al.** in an analogous art teaches modifying source address information in the received telecommunication data to specify a second logical port of the telephone proxy associated with the untrusted device and communicating the data with the modified source address information to the trusted IP telephone (see column 8, lines 28-37 and lines 37-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as combined above to provide the step of modifying source address information in the received telecommunication data to specify a second logical port of the telephone proxy associated with the untrusted device and communicating the data with the modified source address information to the trusted IP telephone as taught by **Cohen et al.** to establish a transparent connection between the trusted device and the untrusted device. This modification would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated by the suggestions provided by **Cohen et al.** so as to establish a transparent connection between the trusted device and the untrusted device.

As per claim 12, **Fiori** discloses the limitation of wherein associating a first logical port of the telephony proxy with the untrusted device comprises associating a User Datagram Protocol (UDP) logical port to enable the streaming of IP packets (column 3, lines 1-6). To a person having ordinary skill in the art, **Fiori** discloses a system capable of exchanging information using UDP (see also column 4, lines 45 et seq. and column 8, lines 1-36).

As per claim 13, Cohen et al. discloses the limitation of wherein modifying the source address information in the received telecommunication data comprises modifying a source IP address and a source port in a header of each IP packet (see column 8, lines 28-37 and lines 37-49).

Claims 35-37 recite the same limitations as claims 11-13 respectively by referring to a software instead of a method and are rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 11-13.

As per claim 43, claim 43 recites some of the limitations found in claim 11 and is rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 11.

As per claim 44, Fiori discloses the limitation of wherein the first and second logical ports are User Datagram Protocol (UDP) logical ports (column 3, lines 1-6). To a person having ordinary skill in the art, **Fiori** discloses a system capable of exchanging information using UDP (see also column 4, lines 45 et seq. and column 8, lines 1-36).

As per claim 45, Cohen et al. discloses the limitation of wherein modifying the source address information in the received telecommunication data comprises modifying a source IP address and a source port in a header of each IP packet (see column 8, lines 28-37 and lines 37-49).

Art Unit: 2136

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. US Patent 6,363,411 Dugan et al.

This patent pertains to an intelligent telecommunications switching network. Many of the claimed features, i.e. list of network addresses permitted or denied access between trusted and untrusted, media streaming, ISDN coupled to the Internet, etc. are disclosed in this reference.

8.1 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 703-305-0355. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and every other Friday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

cc

Carl Colin

Patent Examiner

February 24, 2004



AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100